

Application No. 10/805,155
Response to Office Action mailed June 19, 2006
Page 6 of 8

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended. Thirteen (13) claims remain pending in the application: Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15. Reconsideration of claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15 in view of the amendments above and remarks below is respectfully requested.

By way of this amendment, Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned at (858) 552-1311 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

1. Claims 8 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,666,713 to *Kubota*. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As set forth at M.P.E.P. § 2143.01, a claim is *prima facie* obvious when, among other things, all elements recited in the claim are taught or suggested by the prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that *Kubota* fails to teach or suggest all elements presently recited in claim 8.

For example, claim 8 has been amended to recite "wherein a rectangular volume of the joined first and second computer chassis is less than twice a rectangular volume of the first or second computer chassis." The present Office Action suggests that FIG. 1 of *Kubota* teaches a first chassis 250A joined to a second chassis 250B, wherein the first and second chassis are of identical shape. However, FIG. 1 of *Kubota* shows wherein the rectangular volume of the joined first and second chassis 250A and 250B is equal to – not less than – twice a rectangular volume of the first or second chassis 250A or 250B. Given that claim 8 now recites wherein the rectangular volume of the joined first and second chassis is less than twice the rectangular volume of the first or second chassis, Applicant respectfully submits *Kubota* fails to teach or suggest all elements now recited in claim 8.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that the present rejection has been

455804_1

Application No. 10/805,155
Response to Office Action mailed June 19, 2006
Page 7 of 8

overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the present rejection of claim 8, and of claim 12 which depends from claim 8, is respectfully requested.

2. Claims 9, 10, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over *Kubota* in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0011976 to *Treiber et al.* and U.S. Patent No. 6,991,097 to *Sheehan*. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 9, 10, and 13 depend from claim 8 and, therefore, include all of the elements recited in claim 8. As established above, claim 8 is not rendered obvious by *Kubota*. Moreover, neither *Treiber et al.* nor *Sheehan* add any teaching which, when combined with *Kubota*, would render claim 8 obvious. Because the combined references do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in claim 8 as presently amended, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9, 10, and 13 are not rendered obvious by the combination of *Kubota* in view of *Treiber et al.* and *Sheehan*.

Claim 15 has been amended in a manner similar to the amendment of claim 8. Accordingly, arguments presented above with respect to the rejection of claim 8 (in addition to claims 9, 10, 12, and 13) are equally applicable to the present rejection of claim 15.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that the present rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the present rejection of claims 9, 10, 13, and 15 is respectfully requested.

3. Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over *Kubota* in view of *Treiber et al.* and *Sheehan*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,159,528 to *Murphy*. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended in a manner similar to the amendment of claim 8. Accordingly, arguments presented above with respect to the rejection of claim 8 (in addition to claims 9, 10, 12, and 13) are equally applicable to the present rejection of claim 1. Moreover,

455804_1

Application No. 10/805,155
Response to Office Action mailed June 19, 2006
Page 8 of 8

Murphy does not add any teaching which, when combined with *Kubota* in view of *Treiber et al.* and *Sheehan*, would render claim 1 obvious. Because the combined references do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in claim 1 as presently amended, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and claims 2-6 which depend from claim 1, are not rendered obvious by the combination of *Kubota* in view of *Treiber et al.*, *Sheehan*, and *Murphy*.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that the present rejection has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the present rejection of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the above amendments and remarks place the pending claims in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 28, 2006



Kurt M. Eaton
Reg. No. 51,640
Agent for Applicant
(858) 552-1311

Address all correspondence to:
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
120 So. LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600
Chicago, IL 60603

Direct telephone inquiries to:
Kurt M. Eaton
(858) 552-1311
San Diego, California Office of
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

455804_1